



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ORIGINS OF THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

(*Concluding Articles*¹.)

THE MOUNTAIN OF THE WORLD, THE WORLD OF THE DEAD, AND THE WORSHIP OF DEATH.

IN vol. XI, on pp. 242 and 243, I discussed at some length the myth of the בְּנֵי. This is not so much the central feature of the earth's surface, as it is the earth itself regarded as a great mountain of hemispherical form—the form of a tumulus—corresponding to the dome of sky above. What is very extraordinary, a similar conception appears to exist, not only in India, but among a people so remote and so uncivilized as the Esquimaux².

“The earth, with the sea supported by it, rests upon pillars, and covers an under world, accessible by various entrances from the sea, as well as from mountain clefts. Above the earth an upper world is found, beyond which the blue sky, being of a solid consistence, vaults itself like an outer shell, and, as some say, revolves *around some high mountain-top in the far north*. . . . *The upper world*, it would seem, *may be considered identical with the mountain* round the top of which the vaulted sky is for ever circling. . . . One of the tales also mentions a man going in his kayak (boat) to the border of the ocean, where the sky comes down to meet it.”

The conception therefore would appear to be astronomical rather than geographical in its nature, the summit of the earth corresponding to the celestial pole. This is perhaps

¹ The previous articles appeared in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW as follows: XII, 381; XVII, 57, 489; XVIII, 715; XIX, 688.

² Spencer, *Data of Sociology*, App. A, pp. 807, 808; from Rink, *Tales and Traditions of the Eskimo*, 1875.

the true reason why in Isa. xiv. 13, the mountain is located, *הר מועד* and is described as *בִּרְכְּתִי צֶפֶן*, the latter word bearing the significance, not perhaps of assembly, but of fixed place, or appointed sign (Gen. i. 14).

"According to the old Babylonian conception of the gods and their relation to the world's edifice, En-lil or Bêl of Nippur is 'the king of heaven and earth,' or 'the father' and 'king of the gods' and 'the king of the lands,' i.e. the earth. Bêl's sphere of influence, therefore, is what we generally style 'the world.' It extends from the upper or heavenly ocean (the seat of Anu) to the lower or terrestrial ocean (the seat of Ea), which was regarded as the continuation of the former around and below the earth. In other words, Bêl rules an empire which includes the whole world with the exclusion of the upper and lower oceans, or an empire confined on the one hand by the starry firmament which keeps back the waters of the upper ocean (Gen. i. 6-8) and is called heaven (*an*), and on the other hand by that lower 'firmament' which keeps the waters of the lower ocean in their place (Gen. i. 9, 10) and is called earth (*ki*). But his empire not only lies between these two boundaries, it practically includes them. The *ziggurra*t of Bêl is 'the link of heaven and earth' which connects the two extreme parts of his empire; that is, it is the local representation of the great mythological 'mountain of the world,' *'Kharsag-kurkura*, a structure 'the summit of which reaches unto heaven, and the foundation of which is laid in the clear *apsû*,' i.e. in the clear waters of the subterranean ocean¹."

"Bel, 'the lord' par excellence, who took the place of the Sumerian *En-lil* in the Semitic pantheon, is, as we have seen, the king of this 'middle empire.' His manifestation is 'the wind' (*lil*), and his name designates him therefore as 'the lord (*en*) of the wind' (*lil*) or 'storm,' and of all those other phenomena which frequently accompany it, 'thunder,' 'lightning,' &c. The hundreds of terra-cotta images of Bêl or En-lil discovered at Nippur accordingly represent him generally as an old man (a real 'father of the gods') with a long flowing beard, and a thunderbolt or some other weapon in his hand. He and his consort Bêltis reside in a house on the top of the great 'mountain of the world,' which reaches unto heaven (Gen. xi. 4). There the gods were born, and from thence the 'king of heaven and earth' hurls down his thunderbolts. This house is localized in *Ekur* ('House of the mountain'), Bêl's famous temple at Nippur²."

Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, pp. 462, 463.

² Hilprecht, *op. cit.*, p. 464.

In a previous paper we have seen how the "Lord of Heaven" is lord also of the Storm and of the Mountain-top. Here we see the ruler of the World-mountain exercise the sovereignty of the Storm and of the Sky. The one concept is the converse of the other. And as the "House of the mountain," the "Link of heaven and earth¹," had its parallel in each of the great temples of Chaldea², we may be fairly sure that what was ascribed to Bêl at Nippur would be attributed to Sin or Nannar at Ur-Kasdim, may we not add also, at Uru-shalem?

The Zeus of this Olympus appears in Isa. xiv as עֲלִיין [אל], a name which in Gen. xiv. 18 seq. is ascribed to the God of Shalem. Note also that in Hab. iii. 11 the Moon stands in his זבל (should we not read זבלה?), and it is fair to suppose an analogous relation between Sin and Sinai. Indeed it is probable that there would be a strong tendency to associate with the mythical זבל particular high mountains, such as Sinai and Lebanon.

The Moon, then, is owner of a זבל, in other words בעל זבל, presumably equivalent to זביל [אל], the god of an Israelite tribe, which like that of Asher must have been exposed to Phœnician influences, especially if it be true that, as Cheyne thinks³, a part of their territory was ceded by Solomon to the king of Tyre. In this connexion we may also consider the divine title, בעל צפן the Genius of the North. The term צפן may be legitimately derived from the root צפה, to "keep watch," and interpreted in the sense of "watcher" with reference to the conspicuous constellation which we call the Bear or Wain.

Ἀρκτόν θ', ἥν καὶ ἄμαξαν ἐπὶ κλησιν καλέουσιν
ἥ τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται καὶ τ' Ὠρίωνα δοκεύει,
οἷη δ' ἄμμορος ἐστὶ λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο.⁴

¹ *Dur-anki*, *ibid.*, 462.

² Thus, e. g. the ziggurat of Shamash, both at Sippara and at Larsa, was called *E-Duranki*, 'House of' &c., and that of Marduk at Babylon, *Elemenanki*, 'House of the foundation of heaven and earth.' Hilprecht, p. 464.

³ *E. B.*, art. "Cabul."

⁴ *Il.* xviii. 487.

i. e. the only constellation then known by name¹ of which this could be said. "It must . . . be remembered that the Great Bear lay in Homeric days much nearer the Pole than he does at present, owing to the precession of the equinoxes. There was no obvious Pole Star in the first millenium B.C."² We may be sure that the name of this guiding Sign cannot have been "unheard or unadored" by mariners and colonists of Phoenicia, serving by its position to direct their course, and by its motions answering the inquiry, שמר מה מלילה³. As the Spirit of the North bore the name of בעל צפון, so that of the South may have been known as בעל ימין. Nor is it improbable that the Southern branch of the House of Joseph may have placed itself beneath his protection, and have identified him with the mythical divine child of Rachel-Ephrath. The hypothesis renders plausible the subsequent transformation of בעל ימין into בנימין, analogous to that which has perhaps converted רעובעל into ראובן.

The Babylonian Temple, image of the Mountain of the World, on the one hand, "rises from the earth inhabited by man, unto heaven, the realm of the gods; on the other, it descends to the 'great city' (*urugal*) of the dead, the realm of the departed souls. For, according to Babylonian conception, 'the nether world' (*Arālu*), the abode of the dead, lies directly below and within the earth, or, more exactly, in the hollow space formed by the lower part (*kigal*) of the earth (which resembles an upset round boat, or so-called *qūfa*), and by the lower ocean, which at the same time encircles this 'land without return.' The mountain of the world, therefore, is also called 'the mountain of the nether world' (*shad Arālu*) in the cuneiform inscriptions. As *gigunū* 'grave,' 'tomb,' is used metonymically as a synonym of *Arālu* 'the nether world,' it follows that the *ziggurra*t of Nippur, which is the local representation of the great mountain of the world, also could be called 'the house of the tomb' (*E-gigunū*) or 'the house of the nether world.' It is the edifice that rises over Hades, *quasi* forming the roof beneath which the departed souls reside⁴."

¹ Liddell and Scott, s.v. *ἄρκτος*.

² Leaf, in loc.

³ Isa. xxi. יו שָׁמַר *i. q.* שָׁמַר. "Les Phéniciens . . . se guidaient sur la Petite Ourse. . . . Les Grecs l'appelèrent pour cette raison Phœniké, l'étoile phénicienne." Maspero, II, 195, citing Movers.

⁴ Hilprecht, op. cit., p. 465.

But more than this: the Chaldean Temple-mound is itself a Tomb, and the deity, in Grant Allen's words, "a buried god."

"It is generally known that Strabo (16. 5), in speaking of Babylon, mentions 'the sepulchre of Bêl' (*ὁ τοῦ Βήλου τάφος*), evidently referring to *Etemenanki*, the famous stage-tower of the metropolis on the Euphrates, which he seems to regard as a sepulchral monument erected in honour of Marduk. . . ."

"Diodorus (ii. 7) informs us that Semiramis built a tower in Nineveh as a tomb for her husband Ninos, a story apparently based upon the conception that the ziggurrat of Nineveh likewise was a tomb¹."

"Gudea states expressly that 'he restored *Eninnû-imgig (gu) barbara* [Ningirsu's temple] and constructed his [i. e. the god's] beloved tomb (*gigunû*) of cedar wood in it²."

"Startling as this statement may seem at first, it is in entire accord with the character of the principal god of Lagash, as a god of vegetation and as a sun-god. . . . According to the Babylonian conception, he suffers death in the same way as Tammûz (*Ezek.* viii. 14), the god of the spring vegetation and of the lower regions, with whom Ningirsu is practically identical; or as Shamash, the sun-god himself, who descends into the *apšu*, the terrestrial and subterranean ocean, every evening, and rises out of it again in the morning; who in the spring of every year commences his course with youthful vigour, but gradually grows weaker and weaker until he dies during the winter³. The sun dwelling in 'the nether world' for half a year, the sun-god himself naturally is considered as dead during this period, and Shamash consequently has his tomb in Larsa, and Ai, his wife, at Sippara, as Ningirsu in Lagash. More than this, the ziggurrat of Larsa itself is Shamash's tomb. For on a barrel cylinder from the temple of Shamash and Ai at Larsa, Nabonidos unmistakably calls the god's stage-tower 'his lofty tomb⁴.'"

Consider what all this implies: the Universe is conceived as a gigantic Tomb, having for its lord a buried god, who within and beneath it presides over the World of the Dead. Even the celestial divinities of Chaldea, like the gods of

¹ Hilprecht, op. cit., p. 459.

² Ibid., p. 467.

³ I much question this interpretation. In fact the sun does *not* die during the winter. How can he be considered as dead or "dwelling in the nether world," when he shines overhead every day?

⁴ Hilprecht, pp. 468, 469.

Egypt, were once mortal men. A more impressive confirmation of Grant Allen's theory could hardly be sought for. Yet there is more to come.

On the summit of the Mountain of the World is situate the Garden of the Gods. This appears not only from Ezek. xxviii, 13, 14, but also from the statement of Gen. ii. 10-14, which makes the chief rivers of the known world, Tigris and Euphrates, perhaps Nile and Indus¹, take their rise thence. In the midst of the garden (בתוך הגן, Gen. ii. 9; iii. 3) is the Tree of Life, or of Souls (עץ החיים, ii. 9; iii. 22), and in the midst of the Tree (בתוך העץ, cf. Isa. lxvi. 17) the god Tammuz, the equivalent, if not the original, of the Syrian Adonis and the Egyptian Osiris. This may be inferred from the inscription cited in *Authority and Archaeology*, pp. 19, 20, of which I quote two lines, referring in the first instance to the holy tree of Eridu:

"Its seat was the (central) place of the earth . . .
In its interior is the sun-god Tammuz."

View now these data in the light of what has already been established. It will then appear that the divine garden, of which it could be said יצמח (יהוה) אלהים מן האדמה כל עץ is planted on the Grave of all Mankind, and the sacred tree, incarnating the dying and reviving god, who is himself the Spirit of Vegetation, rises from the summit of the World-Tomb, just as that of Byblos rose from the grave of Osiris, and incorporated his sarcophagus².

It would be difficult to conceive a more decisive vindication of the hypothesis of Grant Allen, which both derived the worship of the Tree-spirit in general from that of the Tree planted on the grave to incorporate the spirit of the dead, and ascribed the origin of cultivation to the growth of food-plants from the fruits thrown there as offerings. He suggests that the primitive field or garden was primarily

¹ Addis, in loc.

² See especially the figure in Maspero, II, 570.

the enclosure of a tomb, and that its fertility was imputed to the agency of the person there buried, whose spirit was supposed to manifest itself in visible form in the vegetation growing on the tumulus—a heap of earth, cleared, sifted, and manured by libations of blood or milk.

Just such a garden, in view of the present writer, was the Garden of the Gods, planted on the Universal Tomb. The further suggestion may be added that the Hanging Gardens of Babylon were in fact a kind of *Ziggurra*, symbolizing the Mountain of the World and the Garden of the Gods upon its summit, as the banqueting-hall of Domitian bore the title *Iovis cenatio*.

The holy tree of Eridu, according to Jensen and Maspero¹, gave its oracles through the medium of a priest attached to its guardianship. Compare what is said of Deborah, Judges iv. 4, 5. Priest and prophetess, we may presume, alike represented and were held to be inspired by the god or *δαίμων* within the tree. And perhaps this is why the second forbidden tree in the Garden of Eden was held capable of communicating the knowledge of good and evil. Compare the prayer of Solomon, 1 Kings iii. 9 להבין בין טוב לרע, with the language of Gen. iii. 5 והייתם כאלהים ידעי טוב ורע (ibid. ver. 22).

The divine sycamores of Egypt, planted on the edge of the desert, but striking root far below ground, and drawing life and nourishment from the waters below the earth—that is, from the under-world, shared with the *עץ חיים*, the power to translate the eater of the fruit bestowed by them to the world of gods². In the same essay in which I called attention to this parallel, I also ventured to suggest that the Serpent might with probability be regarded as the Genius of the Tree of Life³, a visible manifestation of the god within; to associate it with the brazen serpent “which

¹ *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 642, n. 4.

² *J. Q. R.*, vol. X, “The Burning Bush and the Garden of Eden: a Study in Comparative Mythology.”

³ *Ibid.*, p. 498.

Moses made," and which bore the name of Nehushtan ; and to compare the latter, in respect of its healing powers, with the serpent goddess of the Theban tombs, Marîtsakro, "the friend of silence." I ought in this connexion to have referred to the god Asclepios, the divine physician, as to whom Spencer's often-cited Appendix furnishes a most instructive allusion. (P. 799) "Speaking of certain Roman coins, Mr. Warwick Wroth, of the British Museum, says:—

'On the reverse of this specimen Caracalla is represented in military dress, with his right hand upraised to salute a serpent entwined around a tree, its head toward the Emperor. . . . That the serpent who is here receiving adoration is Asklepios is rendered certain both by the presence of Telesphoros, and by a comparison of this piece with another of Caracalla's Pergamene coins. . . . Although the serpent is an attribute of the God of Healing, which is almost invariably present, it is not usual to find the god represented as on the coin now under discussion. Serpents, however, were kept in many of his temples, and indeed were sometimes considered as the incarnation of the deity himself, especially in the transmission of his worship from one city to another. Thus the people of Sikyon traced the origin of their Asklepios cultus to a Sikyonian woman who had brought the god from Epidaurus in the form of a serpent. In the form of a serpent also the god was brought from Epidaurus to Rome. On a famous medallion of Antoninus Pius we see the serpent—that is, Asklepios—about to plunge from the vessel which has conveyed him into the waves of Father Tiber, who welcomes him with outstretched hand, and upon whose island the first Roman temple of the new divinity was afterwards erected. This medallion bears the inscription, Aesculapius¹.'

The healing power of the Serpent, Marîtsakro, Aesculapius, or Nehushtan, may plausibly be derived from its undoubted power to kill. That the nomads of the wilderness should propitiate the Snake-god to avert the consequences of Snake-bite is a thing so natural that we are not obliged to seek a more recondite origin for that especial cult. But Marîtsakro is a goddess of the tombs, while, as we have

¹ "*Asklepios and the Coins of Pergamon* [republished from *The Numismatic Chronicle*, 3rd series, vol. II], by Warwick Wroth, Esq., pp. 47-8."

seen, it is probable that the Serpent of Eden is an incarnation of Tammuz, that god of Death and Resurrection. A third and greater deity, associated with the lower world, also plays his part in the myths of Hebrew scripture; it is the Cosmic Serpent, Leviathan.

At my suggestion (X, 264) of the identity of Leviathan and Levi, a smile crossed the pages of two encyclopaedias. But I doubt whether *these* Leviathans condescended to grasp my argument. It was, in the first place, a particular application of the hypothesis (X, 239) that the tribal name is in general to be regarded as an appellation of the tribal god. Secondly, we must consider that the Brazen Serpent was actually worshipped up till the reign of Hezekiah, and its origin attributed to the Levite Moses. And, thirdly, that Moses was at the same time the reputed founder of the exclusive national cultus of Jahveh, carried on by Levitical priests at Jerusalem. To assume then the identity of Levi, or Leviathan, with Nehushtan, and that the tribal deity was merged in the god of Israel, or, yet more precisely, of Judah (X, 247, 248, 250; XVII, 62, 63) still appears to me the most probable reconciliation of these data—quite apart from totemism. We might, indeed, suppose that the cosmic element in the conception of Leviathan represented an accretion alien to the tribal cult, and derived, like other features of the Judaeae cosmogony, from the traditions of Uru-salimmu, and of Bit-Ninib, or ¹בית (בעל) לזם. But the idea of the World Serpent cannot, I think, be eliminated from the cultus of the God of Sinai and the story of Moses. Before proceeding further, I must offer the additional suggestion that, as the masculine אֱלֹהִים [אֱלֹהִים] has replaced the feminine אֱלֹהִת ², so לֹוִי and לֵוִיָּהוּ have been differentiated, by rejection and addition respectively, from an original feminine לֵוִיָּה ³. And the point is of some importance. For, as we shall presently see, upon one memorable occasion the World Serpent laid an Egg. And that was the origin of the

¹ Cf. ¹בית בעל לזם, discussed by Buchanan Gray.

² XI, 247, 260.

³ Cf. XI, 264.

Universe, to say nothing of the sons of Levi, who were doubtless familiar with the myth.

It would seem that in the imagination of Early Man, the ideas of Night and Darkness, Ocean and Chaos, Death and Hades, are intimately associated and readily interchanged. And the problem of the primitive cosmogonist is, I will not say to explain, but to conceive, the origin of Light out of Darkness, of Land out of Water, and of Life from Death. The remnant of *primaeval* darkness survives in the Night we know (Gen. i. 4, 5) and that of the *primaeval* waters in existing seas (vers. 9, 10)¹.

We have seen, in previous excerpts from Hilprecht, how the waters of the lower ocean encircle the Mountain of the World, which the Chaldeans alleged to be *σκαφοειδῆ καὶ κοίλῃν*, like an upturned circular boat or "kufa."²

"Near the foot of the mountain, the edges of the so-called boat curve abruptly outwards, and surround the earth with a continuous wall of uniform height having no opening. The waters accumulated in the hollow thus formed, as in a ditch³; it was a narrow and mysterious sea, an ocean stream which no living man might cross save with permission from on high, and whose waves rigorously separated the domain of men from the regions reserved to the gods⁴. The heavens rose above the 'mountain of the world' like a boldly formed dome, the circumference of which rested on the top of the wall in the same way as the upper structures of a house rest on its foundations⁵."

¹ "Ainsi, dans la doctrine druidique, la mort précède la vie, la mort engendre la vie, et comme la mort est identique à la nuit, et la vie identique au jour, la nuit précède et engendre le jour." D'Arbois de Jubainsville, *Le Cycle Mythologique Irlandais*, p. 104.

² *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 543, citing Diodorus Siculus.

³ Cf. Gen. i. 9, one "place" or "gathering."

⁴ "The waters which surrounded the earth were called *abzû*, *apsû*, like the primordial waters with which they were sometimes confused" Maspero, footnote.

⁵ *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 544. Maspero here identifies with the *ishid shami*, or "foundations" of the heavens, the *shupuk shami*, which he translates "embankment," but Winckler (art. "Sinai and Horeb") "highway" of the heavens. The former appears to be related to the latter, as the Horizon to the Zodiac. Cf. Judges v. 20.

As the mountain of the gods corresponds to Olympus, so the stream which surrounds the base of Earth, and separates it from the foundations of the Sky, is the obvious counterpart of the Greek Oceanus. I have already cited the Esquimaux tale of the man who crossed it in his boat. So did the Chaldean hero Gilgames¹. Before him, no one had done so from time immemorial, with a single significant exception. "Shamash the valiant crossed the sea; after Shamash, who can cross it?" The myth is transparent;—the land is bounded by the sea, the sea only by the dome of sky. From the meeting of sky and sea, the Sun rises in the morning, and thither he descends at night. Of course as the ocean washes the foundations of the solid vault of heaven, there must be gates through which the Sun may pass.

"At last, the golden Orientall gate
Of greatest heaven gan to open fayre;
And Phoebus, fresh as brydegrome to his mate,
Came dauncing forth, shaking his deawie hayre,
And hurld his glistring beams through gloomy ayre."

And so far as Chaldean art could express the subject, on a diminutive intaglio of green jasper, he may be thus seen in the *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 656. But where does he go to at night?

According to a large class of myths, which may be read in Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, chap. ix, the setting Sun is swallowed up by, or descends into, a world of gloom, which is conceived not so much as a region, or even a state, but as a personal divine being, or supernatural monster, and—here lies the importance of the subject for our purpose—whither the Sun goes, thither go the Souls of the Dead, descending like him into the underworld, or like him swallowed up by the jaws of darkness². This tremendous being is the Greek Aides, the Hebrew Sheol, known also by a name still more awful, צֶלְשָׁוִת, the Shadow of Death.

¹ *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 584.

² *Primitive Culture*, chap. xiii.

What is *his* place in these "begettings of heaven and earth"?

According to the first chapter of Genesis, and the first cosmogony of Philo Byblius, the primal elements of creation were just Wind and Water: רוח אלהים מרחפת על פני המים. We may with probability identify this wind with the רוח ים, חזק מאד, at once a Sea-wind and a West-wind, of Ex. x. 19, which blows from the going down of the Sun, and from the gate of Sheol, and is represented in the symbolism of Ezekiel by the Face of the Vulture. The Vulture then is the mighty bird suggested by the expression מרחפת¹. In another passage of the Byblian, the primordial wind is described by the adjective *κολπίας*, which is said to mean "swelling in folds," a term appropriate enough to describe a sea-breeze by its effects. In this case the wind's wife is *Baav*, "which is interpreted Night." I am inclined to regard it as a name for the West, and connect with the מבוא השמש².

We are more nearly concerned with the תהום of Gen. i. 2, whose identity with the Babylonian *Tiāmat* is now generally accepted. This is the *δαίμων* of the *primaeval* waters, female in sex, and in bodily form a serpent³, the equivalent of the Hebrew לַיִת, presupposed in לַיִת and לַיִת. Her habitation, according to Philo Byblius, was "a chaos turbid and black as Erebus"—חושך על פני תהום—just as the companion wind is described by him as "a dark and condensed windy air, or a breeze of dark air"; as yet there was no light. Impregnated by the Vulture-Wind, the Serpent of the Waters produces an Egg, the mysterious Μωτ. As to this, I must observe that it cannot be identical, either as Halévy supposes with תהום⁴, or as other scholars have imagined, with some Phœnician form of מים⁵ since it is clearly distinguished from both, as the offspring from the parent. By Μωτ,

¹ Cf. Deut. xxxii. 11.

² Cf. *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 672, n. 1; p. 646, n. 2.

³ See *E. B.*, art. "Serpent," § 3 f (col. 4395).

Ibid., art. "Creation," § 7.

Maspero, II, 168, n. 1. Philo's explanation of Μωτ is clearly drawn from Egypt, and as clearly false.

I understand the Hebrew מָוֶת or לֵשֶׁת, the world of Darkness and of Death being held to constitute the antecedent source whence Life and Light emerge, regarded, I presume, as a hard dark shell, the concave of Night without a star. To this supposition it may be objected that according to the Greek text Μωτ is not merely a source of light but is itself luminous;—καὶ ἐξέλαμψε Μωτ ἥλιός τε καὶ σελήνη ἀστέρες τε καὶ ἄστρα μεγάλα. But it must be remembered that the Byblian was professedly translating an ancient Phoenician text, which perhaps in pointed Hebrew would have run much as follows¹: וַיֵּאָר מוֹת אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְאֶת־כּוֹכָבִים, signifying that Death or She'ol—the Dark World regarded as a personal being—lit the lamps of heaven² to give himself light.

Night by night the Sun is swallowed up by the jaws of Darkness: morning by morning he is born again from her womb³. In Egypt, in the City of the Sun, it was told how he, existent before creation, lay hidden in the primal flood, as the closed Eye of Horus, or in a folded lotus-bud, a fairer envelope than the Egg of Death—until at the sublime summons of the uncreated Sun-God, "Come unto me," the flower opened and revealed the divine babe⁴. So, according to the legend, in a basket of reeds, the "door" closed with bitumen, Sargon I once floated on the waters of Euphrates⁵. So, and in such an ark, the child Moses upon those of Nile⁶.

Does the reader follow the implication? If we are to press strictly the interpretation of the myth (and we are

¹ I do not venture to translate the last clause, which may refer either to the planets or the constellations.

² They are thus represented in Egyptian hieroglyphics. *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 16, n. 7.

³ לֵשֶׁת, מוֹת, Jonah ii. 3. Cf. Ps. cx. 3 מוֹתָם [מ] שׁוּר. See the myths in Tylor.

⁴ *Dawn of Civilization*, pp. 137, 138, and 140; fig. on p. 136.

⁵ Ibid., p. 597, n. 6; 599, n. 2: also King, *First Steps in Assyrian*, p. 224.

⁶ See especially *E. B.*, art. "Moses," col. 3207; a passage of admirable learning and lucidity.

not at liberty to neglect it) it will result that Moses, the "son of Levi," prophet of the God of Sinai, and maker of the Brazen Serpent, is himself, like the god of light, the direct offspring of the primal abyss of waters, personified in Liwyath, the Serpent of the Deep. Other circumstances tend to confirm this view.

Cheyne¹ has seen that the ark of Moses is a coin of the same mint with that of Noah, that at least this element in the legend of the prophet comes to us, not from Egypt but from Babylonia. Now the name of Moses has never received a satisfactory explanation either from Hebrew or Egyptian. But Assyrian furnishes the noun *māšu*, signifying "night," with a feminine form *mušītu*, pointing, it would seem, to a root מ"ש². There was a Levite clan Mūši, and I would suggest that it claimed a mythic origin from Night, the child of Chaos, and that the name of מֹשֶׁה is properly its eponym³. I have formerly put forward the hypothesis that the God of Ur-Kasdim and Uru-šalimmu, of Harran and of Sinai, was worshipped by the name of Urru or Uru, 𐎶𐎵 or 𐎶𐎫. Now *urru u māšu*⁴ is equivalent to "Day and Night" (cf. Gen. i. 1-5 and ver. 16). And in a document cited by Delitzsch⁵, Marduk is identified with Sin, "as being Illuminator of the Night," *munammir māši*. Remember how the face of Moses "beamed" as a consequence of his converse⁶ face to face⁷ with the God of Sinai. Must we not recognize in these three elements of the legend of Moses—the Finding, the Name, and the Transfiguration—the features of a myth which told how the primal Dark, offspring of the Storm and of the Deep,

¹ Art. "Moses" sup. cit. Cf. "Bitumen," col. 589.

² Delitzsch, *Ass. Gr. E. T.*, § 65, 3.

³ "Galli se omnes ab Dite patre prognatos praedicant idque ab Druidibus proditum dicunt. Ob eam causam spatia omnis temporis non numero dierum, sed noctium finiunt; dies natales et mensium et annorum initia sic observant ut noctem dies subsequatur." Caes., *B. G.* VI. xviii, §§ 1, 2. So Tacitus, *Germania*, cap. XI: "nox ducere diem videtur." Cf. Gen. i.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 78, p. 213.

⁵ *Babel and Bible*, pp. 144, 145.

⁶ Exod. xxxiv. 29-35 (P.).

⁷ Exod. xxxiii. 11 (E.), Num. xii. 8, Deut. xxxiv. 10.

was lightened by that first rising of the Moon when God said *יהי אור ויהי אור*? We may even find in this hypothesis an explanation of Exod. xxxiii. 23: the full brightness of the god *destroys* the darkness of Night. On the view here taken, there appears no trace of hostility between the power of Light and that of Darkness—rather the former is the benefactor of Night, while Chaos is regarded as its parent. There is a harmony between the three persons of the Myth which enables us to understand how the worship paid to the Serpent could be assigned to Moses, and associated (though on an inferior level) with that addressed to the God of Sinai and Urusalem. We have as yet no parallel to the conflict of Marduk and Tiamat. The myth of Sin was not derived from Babylon, and it was surely no friend to the priests of Marduk who shaped the story of the Tower of Babel. But a very interesting parallel to the association of the Brazen Serpent with the cultus of Jahveh is supplied by a marble tablet, found by Rassam in 1881, buried carefully in an inscribed terra-cotta trough or box closed with a lid, beneath the asphalt pavement of a chamber in the sanctuary of Sippara, and bearing a relief, accompanied by inscriptions, expressly designed to transmit to posterity the authentic “Image of Shamash, the great lord, dwelling in Ebabbara, situated in Sippar¹.”

The waters of Ocean (*apsû*) occupy the base of the relief. Above, the god is seen in profile, seated upon his throne, beneath a canopy, of which the back and top are formed by *an immense snake* “whose head can be clearly recognized over the column in front of the god.” I may add that the curved form and slender proportions of the serpent suggest the employment of metal in its construction. Here, then, is a likeness of Nehushtan, and the column which supports its head may be compared with the *נֹזֶל* of Num. xxi. 8, 9. In the field of the relief are placed the conjoined disk and crescent of Sin, beside the emblems of Shamash and Ishtar.

¹ Hilprecht, op. cit., pp. 269-72. Cf. *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 657.

I must not linger on the interesting details of this monument, but I suspect that the column is a sacred tree, and that tree and serpent alike might find their analogues in the palms and wreaths (לִיֹּחַ, *si vera lectio*) among the ornaments of Solomon's temple; for the ornaments of ancient art have commonly a symbolic meaning. The relation of לִילָה to לָלַח, i.e. of *la-ya-la-ya* to *la-wa-ya* is another tempting subject of inquiry and speculation, which must firmly be put aside. Was the Night also accounted a Snake? The decision must be left to the Philologists.

The direct worship of Death, *eo nomine*, has left but few traces in the Hebrew scriptures. In that which may be distinguished as the cosmic conception, Death is parallel with Sheol. Here belongs the *mashal* in Cant. viii. 6:

כִּי עֵזָה כְּמוֹת אֶהְבֶּה

קֶשֶׁה כְּשֹׂאֹל קְנָאָה

in accordance with which we must interpret the proper name עֵזָה¹, which should in turn be compared with עֹזְבֵל and עֹזֵר², and with the various names in which the root עֹז supplies a predicate of יָה or אֵל. By whomsoever borne, clan, town, or individual, the appellation "Strong is Death" is no mere platitude but implies a direct ascription of praise to Death considered as a god. Nor can we doubt that the inhabitants of הַצְרֹמִית counted themselves among his worshippers, and that אֶחֱיָמֹת claimed him for a brother. The explanation is not far to seek. Like the terrible Chaldean divinity Nergal (who is also the god of pestilence and of the destroying summer sun), Death is not only lord of the underworld, but also a god of War.

Philo Byblius also tells us how "Kronus offered up his only son as a sacrifice to his father Ouranos, and circumcised himself, and compelled his allies"—τοὺς ἄμ' αὐτῷ συμμαχούς—"to do the same: and not long afterwards he consecrated after his death another son, named Muth, whom he had by

¹ 2 Sam. xxiii. 31; 1 Chron. viii. 36; Gray, p. 231.

² E. B., s. v. Azgad.

Rhea. The Phoenicians call him Death and Pluto¹." Here, I think, we have to do with the dying god, Tammuz or Adonis; and in spite of the contradictory statements just cited, we may fairly identify him with that only son of Kronos, who, as we learn from another fragment, expressly attributed to Sanchoniathon², was offered in sacrifice *invested with the emblems of royalty*—*βασιλικῇ κοσμήσας σχήματι*—a circumstance which at once brings him into the class of royal and divine victims dealt with by Frazer³. If he is identified with Pluto, he has become the god of Sheol, which brings this conception of Death into harmony with the cosmic type. It will be observed that while the divine victim affords an excellent illustration of the Spencerian theory adopted and developed by Grant Allen, the cosmic idea of Death appears a good instance of the exception admitted by the latter, the class of gods "directly framed either from abstract conceptions, from natural objects, or from pure outbursts of the mythopoeic faculty⁴."

In discussing the implications of the name, עֲזַמּוֹת, I purposely postponed the comparison with עֲזַזְלָל, which Cheyne, with reason, regards as the original form of עֲזַזְלָל. On this view it will follow that the ascription "God is strong" has passed in usage into the proper name of the particular deity to whom, we must suppose, it was originally addressed. A similar supposition may be entertained with regard to עֲזַמּוֹת, and in that case we may consider בית עֲזַמּוֹת as, at least in origin, the sanctuary of a god of Death. And, further, combining the well-established principle of the identity of the victim and the god, with the cases adduced by Frazer in which Death (so called) fulfils the office of a scapegoat, we may with some probability infer the equivalence of עֲזַמּוֹת and עֲזַזְלָל, and reach the conclusion that the scapegoat was in fact devoted to Sheol.

¹ Cory, pp. 16, 17.

² Ibid., pp. 21, 22 (the Greek from Müller).

³ *The Golden Bough*, 2nd ed., vol. II, chap. iii. § 1.

⁴ *J. Q. R.*, XII, 393, also 401.

"The use of the divinity as a scapegoat clears up the ambiguity which, as we saw, appears to hang about the European folk-custom of 'carrying out Death.' Grounds have been shown for believing that in this ceremony the so-called Death was originally the spirit of vegetation, who was annually slain in spring, in order that he might come to life again with all the vigour of youth. But, as I pointed out, there are certain features in the ceremony which are not explicable on this hypothesis alone. Such are the marks of joy with which the effigy of Death is carried out to be buried or burnt, and the fear and abhorrence of it manifested by the bearers. But these features become at once intelligible if we suppose that the Death was not merely the dying god of vegetation, but also a public scapegoat, upon whom were laid all the evils that had afflicted the people during the past year." *The Golden Bough*, vol. III, p. 121.

The three characters or *ὑποστάσεις* of Death the Scapegoat¹—the Hebrew Azazel; Death as the dying and reviving god of vegetation and fertility—Tammuz, Adonis, or Osiris; and Death as the God of War—the Babylonian Nergal;—appear to have been shared by Mars, in early times the principal divinity of the Roman people; and were there no resemblance in form between *Mars* and *mors*, we should still be justified in inferring their identity of meaning. And a note in the *Fasti Praenestini*, which has caused Mr. Warde Fowler some perplexity², and which runs: . . . [VEDI]OVI [M]ARTIS VEDIOVIS INTER DUOS LUCOS, may be explained by the very simple suggestion that "Vediovis" was in fact a Mars, that is, a Death. This appears (*a*) from the name of the god³, *quasi ἀντίθετος*, (*b*) from the sites of his worship *outside* the pomerium, one of them the Asylum, which (*c*) connects him with the associations of the scapegoat, the other in the Tiber island, which (*d*) brings him into relation with the worship of the Serpent-god, Aesculapius, already discussed; and also from the circumstances that the god was represented as (*e*) *holding arrows*, and (*f*) *having a goat standing beside him*; while (*g*) the usual victim was a goat which was

¹ Frazer, *G. B.*, III, 122; compare, however, Warde Fowler, *Roman Festivals* (1899), under March 14, pp. 44-50.

² *op. cit.*, p. 43.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

sacrificed *humano ritu*. "Humanum sacrificium dicebant quod *mortui causa fiebat*¹." We may compare the expiatory rite enjoined in Deut. xxi. 1-9, where the heifer, writes Driver, "is manifestly designed as a substitute for the unknown murderer, and bears the penalty which ought properly to be his." We may then infer that originally, like the scapegoat, it was *הרם* to a god of Death.

The analogy of Vediovis and Azazel furnishes a good example of the mutual illustration of Biblical and Classical Antiquities, and of what I have ventured to describe as the "common religion," correlated with the "common civilization" of the ancient world².

Death, as the god of war, is necessarily the first shedder of man's blood, since it could not be shed without him. And Mars, as god of the Spear (Quiris, Quirinus) is parallel with the Biblical *קין* or *קין*. It is not then surprising that the story of Cain and Abel should be matched by that of Romulus and Remus, since the former is hardly to be distinguished from his father Mars. Again, under the form Mamurius, Mars appears like Cain, or Tubal, as the first smith, maker of the Ancilia³, and perhaps the first instruments of agriculture⁴; and Mamurius is beaten out of the city⁵, as Cain is driven out from the face of the ground. And as Tubal is associated with Jubal, i. q. *יובל*, or "Ram's horn," *אבי כל חפץ כנור ועונה*, so the lustration of the Ancilia on March 19 was followed on the 23rd by that of the *tubae* or *tubi*, the trumpets "used chiefly in military and religious ceremonies"⁶; while a similar lustration on May 23 is described by Ovid in these terms⁷:—

"Proxima *Volcani* lux est: Tubilustria dicunt;
Lustrantur purae, quas facit ille, tubae."

¹ Ibid., p. 122.

² *J. Q. R.*, XVII, 57. I may add that the youth of the god corresponds to the youth of the victim in Deut. xxi. 3.

³ Warde Fowler, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

⁴ "formae caelator aenae,

Tellus artifices ne premat Osca manus," *ibid.*, p. 47.

⁵ Ibid., p. 46.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 63, 64.

⁷ Ibid., p. 123.

Special cults on the part of *artifices* and *tibicines* seem also to have been associated with March 19 and 23¹, and in connexion with the Tubilustrium on the latter date we meet with an obscure allusion to the *clava* of Romulus², apparently regarded as a *tuba incurva*.

It will be observed that the same ambiguity as to whether the first smith, Tubal or Vulcan, should be identified with or distinguished from the war-god, Cain or Mamurius, occurs both in the Hebrew and Latin sources. Ovid may be following Greek mythology. But May 23 is marked in two calendars, drawn up ante A.D. 46, as "Feriae Volcano," and as the Romans certainly worshipped the Fire of the Hearth as Vesta, it does not seem improbable that apart from foreign influence, they may have revered that of the Forge under the name of Vulcan. As regards the biblical parallel, it is clear that Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal belong to the pastoral life, while Cain and Mars are alike gods of agriculture and founders of cities.

The status of the outlawed manslayer, whose life is nevertheless protected by religion, which is ascribed to Cain, when compared with the story told by Livy, how Romulus (who, for our purpose, may be regarded as the vicar of Mars) "*asylum aperit*," which must have been *Marti Vediovi sacrum*, raises the question whether the fugitive homicide, *Dis Infernis devotus*, may not have placed himself beneath the protection, and entered into the service of Death, the God of War?

The association of the trumpet and weapons of war in the Roman ceremonial, and the use made of the שופרות הויכלים in the narrative of Josh. vi (the magical circumambulation of Jericho), serve to explain the conjunction of Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal. The ram's horn trumpet is regarded as the primary instrument of music, but its employment especially, though not exclusively, belongs to the religion of war. The horns employed may have been those of the

¹ Warde Fowler, op. cit., pp. 57, 62.

² Ibid., p. 64.

victims sacrificed to the ram-god, אֵל or יֵל, in order to "hallow war." Their sound would be considered as the god's voice, and be produced in order to express, or to procure, his presence.

We have traversed in these pages a great part of the religion of antiquity, though by a devious route, which has nevertheless enabled us to survey the several provinces of Bel's empire, and observe their mutual relations. The general reflections, to which the data here collected may give rise, must be postponed to a subsequent article (p. 761 below), which must also deal with the relation between the Worship of the Dead and that of the Host of Heaven.

Mr. Holman Hunt has somewhere placed on record the difficulties and risks which he encountered when painting, in the Holy Land, his celebrated picture of *The Scapegoat*. Fearful lest, upon the completion of his task, himself or his work might be detained, he resorted to an innocent deception, with regard to the probable date of his departure. With the loving care of the Pre-Raphaelite, he filled in all the details of his landscape, leaving the ostensible subject a vast white blank in the middle of the picture, to be supplied at leisure when the more difficult part of his task was done. So, if my reader should be disposed to inquire, what all this has to do with the Religion of Israel? I must as yet be content to answer, I have tried to depict a *background*.

The foregoing pages were written in the closing months of 1904. The reader will find it advantageous to compare what has been said on the subject of Vediovis with the learned yet original treatment of the same topic in the third of Mr. A. B. Cook's papers on "The European Sky-God" (*Folk-Lore*, Sept. 1905, p. 273). Mr. Cook insists upon the chthonian character of Vediovis, but regards him as a subterranean Jupiter. As, however, Mr. Cook also maintains that Mars "was but a specialized form of Jupiter" (*ibid.*, p. 320); and, indeed, that Jupiter, Mars,

and Quirinus "were but differentiated forms of one and the same deity" (p. 321), the discrepancy between his view and mine is more apparent than real. He does not, I think, mention the note in the *Fasti Praenestini*.

It begins to appear more and more probable that Quirinus and Romulus are alike mere epithets of a god of War and Death. Note in this connexion that "a law, attributed to Romulus, ordained that a patron or client who neglected his duties might be put to death by any man¹, as a victim devoted to the chthonian Jupiter, i. e. to Vediovis" (Cook, p. 273). "Romulus, according to the usual tradition, was caught up to heaven in a thunderstorm, but subsequently appeared in more than mortal beauty to Proculus Julius, and announced that he had become the god Quirinus" (ibid., p. 286). But a darker tradition preserved by Livy, Plutarch, and Dionysius (ibid., p. 324) relates that he was torn to pieces by the hands of the fathers *in the temple of Vulcan* and the fragments distributed among them to be buried in the earth like the members of Osiris, or those of the Meriah of the Khonds.

The identity of (Mars) Romulus with Mars Quirinus and Mars Vediovis, and his association with Vulcan, already referred to, appear clearly enough in these passages.

The Monist for October, 1905, contains an interesting article by Mr. A. H. Godbey, of the University of Chicago, on "The Semitic City of Refuge." I will transcribe the passage most relevant to our subject:—

"Among all North American Indians burial places are regarded with peculiar reverence, but perhaps this is especially marked among North-west Coast tribes. The burial places of chieftains are to be especially guarded from sacrilege. As a consequence, private individuals and medicine men sometimes claim to be protégés of the spirits of the dead. In some South African tribes and in the South Sea Islands the burial places of chieftains are asyla. In Samoa a tree at the burial place of a chieftain famous as a dispenser of primitive justice is known as an asylum for the criminal; in this case there seems to be an appeal to the spirit of the chieftain for justice. In the

¹ Gen. iv. 14 b.

Kingsmill Islands each chieftain has his sacred mark or device, usually of red paint. A stranger may claim the protection of the chief and wear the same mark¹. This almost leaves the sacred ground idea for that of the clan totem or badge. But the sacred mark here is not tribal, it seems. Among the Afghans the tombs of ascetics and holy persons are looked upon as places of refuge for murderers, where they may remain till the avenger of blood passes by. In most of these instances the connexion with ancestor worship is to noticed " (loc. cit., p. 606).

With these data before us we can have little doubt as to the true nature alike of the father of the Kenite and the founder of Rome. Whether a deified individual or an individualized deity, he is in either case a god of Death and Bloodshed, to whom the outlaw might indeed be sacrificed, but from whom also he might claim protection. I have assumed throughout that מִשְׁקֶל really does mean spear, or perhaps more exactly the artificial or "made" part of spear, "opificium" as well as "opifex." I see no valid reason why we should not accept in this sense the reading of 2 Sam. xxi. 16 מִשְׁקֶל מֵאֵשׁ מִשְׁקֶל נְחֹשֶׁת : καὶ ὁ σταθμὸς τοῦ δόρατος αὐτοῦ τριακοσίων σίκλων ὀλλκῇ χαλκοῦ, "cuius ferrum hastae trecentas uncias appendebat." Compare לְהִכָּת מִנְיָתוֹ, 1 Sam. xvii. 7 ἡ λόγχη αὐτοῦ, *ferrum hastae*. The metal may have been copper or bronze. See *E. B.*, art. "Copper": "The Assyrians used bronze axes as late as the ninth century." At Tell el-Hesi "in the remains of the Amorite city (perhaps 1500 B. C.) there are large rough weapons of war, made of copper without admixture of tin; above this, dating perhaps from 1250 to 800, appear bronze tools, but the bronze gradually becomes scarcer, its place being taken by iron" (cited from Dr. J. H. Gladstone, "The Metals of Antiquity," *Nature*, April 21, 1898, p. 596). Cf. Gen. iv. 22.

Finally, I may observe that the remarkable name מִצְרַת מָוֶת, quasi "Death-garth," the modern Hadramaut, occurs in regions of the Semitic world as far apart as the South of Arabia, Africa propria (Hadrumetum = Ἀδρουμήτος = מִצְרַת מָוֶת ?)

¹ Gen. iv. 15 b; Isa. xlv. 5 b. Red paint is a surrogate for blood.

and Mysia (Adramyttēos, -ēum, ūm = Ἀδραμύττειον = חַצְרֵמַת?).

I hardly dare to add the further question: *Was Rome, too, of Semitic origin?* Yet Warde Fowler has remarked "it is certain that even before the eighth century B. C. the whole western coast of Italy was open first to Phoenician trade and then to Greek¹ . . . We may take it as not impossible that the *ara maxima*² was older than the traditional foundation of Rome, and that its cult was originally not that of the characteristic Italian Hercules, but of an adventurous deity established there by foreign adventurers³."

With regard to the mysterious monuments beneath the pavement of Black Stone in the Roman Forum—"Romuli morti destinatum," designed for the *corpse* of Romulus—I would suggest that "the two parallel pedestals accurately facing north⁴," and the "long narrow tufa base⁵" at the back of them, are the remains of a *throne* rather than a tomb; and that the sepulchral monument attributed to Romulus is rather to be sought in the truncated cone hard by.

THE SONS OF THE GODS.

The Religion of Israel stands towards that of the ancient world at large—that diversified, yet on the whole harmonious, system of thought and usage, on which old writers bestowed the convenient name of "Gentilism"—in the twofold relation of a Reform and of a Compromise. We know that much was expressly rejected and condemned; for instance, Polytheism and Idolatry. And we know, too, that much was retained; that in spite of disparagement on the part of Prophet and Psalmist, the antique rite of Circumcision continued to be enforced, and that of Sacrifice was not only accepted but developed. These obvious con-

¹ *The Roman Festivals*, p. 197.

² *Herculi Invicto ad Circum Maximum*.

³ *Ibid*.

⁴ Baddeley, *Recent Discoveries in the Forum*.

⁵ Burton-Brown, *Recent Excavations in the Roman Forum*.

siderations are but a part of the truth. To compare the Faith and Worship of Israel with that of her neighbours in old time is like comparing an unique MS. with the vulgate text. We must take account not only of its "adhesions" but also of its "abstentions." We must note what is silently omitted or intentionally modified, no less than that which is added to the record of the past. Only thus can we estimate aright the documents of a Reformation.

A reader of my previous papers might with some justice allege that I have been at the pains to elucidate precisely that which the religion of Israel rejected, and which appears in the Hebrew Scriptures only in scattered allusions, such as the physiologist would describe as "vestiges" and the anthropologist as "survivals." I reply, this is a necessary task, and will contribute to place in a clearer light the point of departure of the Reform, the spirit which animated it, and the results achieved.

Thus it is nowhere explicitly commanded, "Thou shalt not devise fables touching Jahveh thy God, neither shalt thou tell that which is unseemly concerning him." But the implied principle is steadily acted on. Tacitly, and upon the whole, the Bible *rejects Mythology*. Why is this? It may be said that in the nomad stage, when doubtless the faith of Israel first took shape, as in the early days of the Roman people, the insistence of religion was upon cultus and conduct, leaving little scope to the play of imagination. And if we could be assured of this, it would be a sufficiently remarkable result. But even if this were so, yet considering the vivid and varied presentment of human life in the Scriptures, and the concrete personal character ascribed to the God of Israel, the persistent refusal to make him the subject of mythology, or to apply to him the myths current in the ancient world, appears even more remarkable.

The nearest approach to fables such as I have in mind is to be found in the earlier narratives of Genesis, especially

in such allusions as are contained in iii. 8, xi. 5, xviii. 21. But these are marked exceptions, they are presumably of great antiquity, and not improbably of foreign origin, just such "vestiges" as above described.

One of the most important among the abstentions of the Bible is its steadfast, silent refusal to ascribe to God the fundamental human relationships. Nowhere indeed is it laid down, as in a famous passage of the Koran, "He begetteth not, neither is he begotten;" but this truth is uniformly assumed. Jahveh is neither Son, nor Lover, nor Husband, nor Father—except in metaphor. We do not know that it was always thus. Here again the Roman parallel is suggestive. "In the whole range of Italian religions," says Jordan, quoted by Warde Fowler¹, "*liberorum procreatio nulla est unquam*." But it lacks support from the Semitic side. It is possible, and I do not think it improbable, that in an early age the 'ēl of Israel, or Israel's predecessors, may have been regarded like Joseph (= Ephraim) or Benjamin, as the son of the divine matriarch; or as her suitor, like the hero Jacob. Or as Abram had Sarah to wife, and the God of Harran the *šarrat šamē*², so may Jahveh have had his consort in the ancestress of Israel. The prophet Hosea, standing nearer than the rest to the point of departure of the reformers, represents the relations of Israel to Jahveh under a parable of the most tender human affections; Israel is his (alas!) unfaithful wife, Ephraim his beloved but rebellious son³. The parable may be justly held to imply an older myth, and the supposition is confirmed by the large class of names which, at least in origin, imply kinship with Israel's God. But all such considerations only make it plainer than before that Israel was well acquainted with a mode of thought which the Hebrew Scriptures silently put aside.

¹ *Roman Festivals*, p. 224. Compare p. 37, text and note 3; an instructive passage. And see Frazer, *Adonis Attis Osiris*, Ed. 2, App. II, § 2, "The Marriage of the Roman Gods" (p. 410).

² Or at least *šarratu*.

³ Cf. Exod. iv. 22, 23.

In modern language we should attribute this selective and discriminative action to the religious genius of Israel; the Hebrew prophets might have said, "Israel guided by the Spirit of God;" Herbert Spencer, I suppose, "the power which in ourselves wells up under the form of consciousness." Is there really any difference?

In the preceding article of this series, I have collected a body of data which, on the whole, tend to demonstrate the immense importance of the Worship of the Dead, and to support the Spencerian theory which seeks in it the Origin of Religion. But here again we must note the marked abstention of the Old Testament. If such was the origin of the religion of Israel, then (which is quite possible) it has in the Bible advanced to a stage at which it repudiates its parentage. The Worship of the Dead is ignored, except upon the rare occasions when it is explicitly condemned¹.

Two points of vital importance distinguish the "Old Testament" from the "New." It is the uniform witness of the first, that the God of Israel, who is the God of the Universe, is a single, unique, Person. It is equally clear that the idea of a Future Life had no place in the Religion of Israel. That religion was concentrated upon the ideal personality of Jahveh, and upon his moral relations with his people, potentially with all mankind, in the world of actual human life, and in the experience of the race. From the standpoint of the Hebrew Scriptures the Immortality of the Soul is neither a necessary nor an actual postulate of the moral consciousness². And it was not that the teachers of Israel were unacquainted with the thought and practice, the hopes and fears, which in one form or another prevailed throughout the ancient world upon this subject, but that they deliberately put all this upon one side, as foreign, if

¹ Deut. xiv. 1, 2. Cf. Lev. xix. 28 and xxi. 1-6. Also Deut. xxvi. 14.

² Even in Job it is not a pre-supposition but at most *un grand peut-être*. Compare moreover such passages as Micah vi. 8; Deut. xxix. 29; Job xxviii. 28; Eccles. *ad fin.*

not hostile, to the office of religion ; much as the Protestant Reformers repudiated the Worship of the Saints, and the Prayers for the Dead, which had come to play so great a part in Catholic Christianity. Nay more, there supervened (for I dare not affirm that it was original) a direct antagonism between the Religion of Jahveh and the Worship of Death. We have seen this already illustrated in the case of Azazel. A Tammuz or Osiris, that god of Death and Resurrection, was incorporate in the Tree of Life, and manifested in the Serpent of Eden ; and Jahveh pronounces the Serpent accursed. The Brazen Serpent, sharing with the goddess of the Theban tombs the power to kill and make alive, is set up by Moses at the express command of Jahveh ; it is destroyed by the reforming Hezekiah. The Serpent of Ocean, associated and perhaps confounded with Sheol, was once esteemed the parent of the tribe of Levi and the prophet Moses ; in time Jahveh becomes the slayer of Leviathan. The infection of the supernatural, corresponding to the idea of "tabu," originally one, is severed into the opposite poles of holiness and uncleanness ; the associations of the cultus are "holy" and those of Death "unclean."

It is possible that here again we have a deliberate return to the traditions of the wilderness, as opposed to the elaborate, the engrossing development, which the Religion of the Sepulchre attained in the settled lands, and amid the Cities of the Dead, on the banks of the Euphrates and the Nile. And this supposition derives considerable support from a noteworthy passage of Hilprecht's often-cited work.

"It is interesting," he writes, "to observe how certain religious ideas of the Semitic conquerors . . . seem finally to have brought about a radical change of the ancient burial customs in Babylonia. With regard to Nippur, this change can be traced to about the period of Sargon I, after whose government no more burials occur in the sacred precinct of *Ekur* . . . In fact we do not know yet how the Semitic inhabitants of ancient Nippur generally disposed of their dead."

Gudea, Hilprecht thought, did the same for *Shir-pur-la*.

“ He stopped cremating and burying the dead in the environments of the Temple of Ningirsu, and levelled the ground of the ancient cemetery around it, with due regard to the numerous burial urns and coffins previously deposited there. In other words, ‘ he cleaned the city ’ and ‘ made the Temple of Ningirsu a pure place like Eridu ’, the Sacred city of Ea, where, apparently, in the earliest days, burials were not allowed¹. ”

If this be so, it would seem that even in that remote age there had already arisen an antithesis between Gods and Ghosts, such that the Tombs of the former might no longer be surrounded by those of men. Here, again, the parallel between the Roman and the Semite, though not exact, is nevertheless instructive. The reader will recall the law of the XII Tables, which prohibited intra-mural interment: “ *hominem mortuum in urbe ne sepelito neve urito.* ” And so deeply rooted was the sentiment associated with the law, that at the end of the sixth century A.D., Augustine, the “ Apostle of the English ” and first Archbishop of Canterbury, fixed, upon this account, the burial place of himself and his successors in the monastery which afterwards bore his name, outside the walls of his cathedral city. In sum, if we seek in the cult of the dead the Origin of Religion, we must admit the differentiation of Religion from the cult of the dead.

We now approach the principal subject of this paper; the identification of the Souls of the Dead with the Host of Heaven, and their re-incarnation at the conception of the Living.

In transcribing, at the commencement of the previous article, the passage cited by Spencer from the work of Dr. Rink upon the Esquimaux², I purposely omitted the following extract, as more suited to the present place :—

“ The upper world exhibits a real land, with mountains, valleys, and lakes. After death, human souls either go to the upper or

¹ *Explorations in Bible Lands*, pp. 466, 467.

² *Data of Soc.* : App. A., pp. 807, 808.

to the under world. The latter is decidedly to be preferred, as being warm and rich in food. There are the dwellings of the happy dead called *arsissut*—viz., those who live in abundance. On the contrary, those who go to the upper world will suffer from cold and famine, and these are called *arssartut*, or ball-players, on account of their playing at ball with a walrus-head, which gives rise to the aurora borealis or northern lights."

"The whole visible world is ruled by supernatural powers or 'owners,' taken in a higher sense, each of whom holds his sway within certain limits, and is called *inua* (viz., its or his, *inuk*, which word signifies 'man,' and also *owner* or inhabitant¹). (Rink, p. 37.)

"The upper world is also inhabited by several rulers besides the souls of the deceased. Among these are the owners or inhabitants of celestial bodies, who having been once men, were removed in their lifetime from the earth, but are still attached to it in different ways, and pay occasional visits to it. They have also been represented as the celestial bodies themselves, and not their *inua* only, the tales mentioning them in both ways. The owner of the moon originally was a man called Aningaut, and the *inua* of the sun was his sister." (Rink, pp. 48-9. Spencer, p. 808).

It will not escape the reader that the Esquimaux *inuk* is in this use the equivalent of the Hebrew בן. And if the anthropologist conjectures that the Hebrew concept of the stars as "sons of the gods" was in origin analogous to that entertained by the Esquimaux, not only is the hypothesis unquestionably legitimate, but it applies with equal force to the deities of Sun and Moon, to Shamash and to Sin. It should, however, be observed that these "inhabitants of celestial bodies" are, like the Biblical Enoch, immortal (Gen. v. 21-24).

I must also here refer to the passages translated for Herbert Spencer by Dr. Scheppig from the work of Fr. Spiegel, *Erânische Alterthumskunde*, vol. II (1873) which describe the ancient Persian conception of the *fravashi*². The *fravashi* seems to be very like the Roman *genius*. It is at once a part of the soul and an external protecting power. "Every living being has a *fravashi*, not only in

¹ Spencer, *Data of Soc. App. A.*, p. 789.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 809-11.

the terrestrial but in the spiritual world." They include at the same time the souls of the dead (*manes*, heroes, and ancestors) and those of the unborn. Collectively the *fravashis* are identified with the stars, and form, according to Spiegel, the host that fights against the demons. Here again we approach the region of Hebrew thought. The biblical student will perhaps reply, The Esquimaux or Persian conceptions may afford an antecedent to those of the Old Testament for aught I know to the contrary; but, if so, it must be admitted that at the earliest date of which we have historic evidence (a period, after all, not so very remote) the latter had already passed into a different stage. Even in Gen. vi. 1-4, the sons of the gods, though associated with, are clearly distinguished from the children of Man. To this the anthropologist will answer, that the former, like the Rephaim, Emim, and Zamzummim¹, or perhaps like our own fairies, are the mere ghosts of pre-historic races converted by tradition into supernatural beings. Why then, it may be asked, are the heroes, "the mighty men which were of old, men of renown," their offspring? The reply of Anthropology is equally cogent and surprising². The Native Tribes of Central Australia, described by Messrs. Spencer and Gillen,

"Have no notion that mankind is propagated by the union of the sexes, indeed, when the idea is suggested to them they steadfastly reject it. Their own theory to account for the continuation of the species is sufficiently remarkable. They suppose that in certain far-off times, to which they give the name of 'Alcheringa,' their ancestors roamed about in bands, each band consisting of members of the same totem-group. Where they died their spirits went into the ground and formed, as it were, spiritual store-houses, the external mark of which is some natural feature, generally a stone or tree. Such spots are scattered all over the country, and the ancestral spirits who haunt them are ever waiting for a favourable opportunity to be born again into the world. When one of them sees his chance he pounces out on a passing girl or woman and

¹ See Driver (quoting Robertson Smith), Commentary on Deut., p. 40.

² Frazer, "The Origin of Totemism," *Fortnightly Review*, April and May, 1899, especially p. 649.

enters into her. Then she conceives, and in due time gives birth to a child, who is firmly believed to be a reincarnation of the spirits that darted into the mother from the rock or tree¹."

Hartland, in his *Legend of Perseus* (vol. i, p. 164) writes :

"In the same way Algonkin women who sought to become mothers flocked to the couches of those about to die, in hope that the vital principle, as it passed from the dying, would enter their bodies and fertilize their sterile wombs. Among the Hurons in the seventeenth century, babes who died under one or two months were not placed, like older persons, in sepulchres of bark raised on stakes, but buried in the road, in order that they might enter secretly into the wombs of passing women and be born again."

And this notion, common to the natives of Australia and North America, existed among the earliest Greeks, and has left its traces in the *Odyssey*, xix. 163 :

ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς μοι εἶπὲ τεὸν γένος, ὀππόθεν ἔσσι.
οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ δρυὸς ἔσσι παλαιφάτου οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης.

"Not from the rock or tree², of ancient tales."

And in *Iliad*, xxii. 126-8, Hector, in his famous soliloquy before the final encounter with Achilles³, draws the reflection :—

οὐ μὲν πως νῦν ἔστιν ἀπὸ δρυὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης
τῷ δαριζέμεναι, ἃ τε παρθένος ἡϊθέος τε,
παρθένος ἡϊθέος τ' δαρίζετον ἀλλήλοιν.

which appears to mean :—

"Beginning from ancestral rock or tree,
Parley of old descent."

We may now understand why the Hebrew *gibborim*, like the Greek heroes, were born of human mothers, but without a human father. A god, if we may use the term in the sense in which Elohim is applied to the shade of Samuel by the Witch of Endor, a pre-existent and perhaps ancestral spirit, like the Persian *fravashi*, enters into the mother

¹ See Appendix, p. 776 below.

² δρῶν ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοὶ πᾶν δένδρον, *Schol. Il. XI*, 86.

³ "Oak and rock" (Arthur Bernard Cook), *Classical Review*, July, 1901, p. 322.

and is incarnate in her offspring. (1) Here there is no question of sexual intercourse, for in this early stage of man's development paternity is still unrecognized. Every human being is an embodied ghost. (2) Later on, it is especially the Hero, who, by virtue of his mighty deeds, is recognized as of divine origin, that is, a god incarnate. (3) And when the notion of paternity has become established, the Heroes are of necessity regarded as the sons of divine fathers, the Elohim, who are in turn identified with the host of heaven.

Here arises an interesting question. In Gen. vi. 4, the Nephilim are closely associated with the Gibborim. In Num. xiii. 33 the בני ענק are of the Nephilim. In Deut. ii. 10-12 and 20-23, the Anakim are reckoned with the Rephaim, called by the Moabites Emim, and by the Ammonites, Zamzummim. Now there is good reason to believe that Nephilim and Rephaim, Emim and Zamzummim are, like our own fairies, the ghosts of prehistoric or at least extinct races. And the question may be asked whether these are not identical with the divine ancestors of the Gibborim¹?

The doctrine of Re-incarnation serves to explain a difficulty which has probably been observed by readers of the preceding article in this series. The Garden of the Gods is planted, it would seem, upon the Grave of all Mankind; yet the Origin of Mankind is traced to the Garden of the Gods. The inconsistency is patent, but it becomes intelligible if we suppose that the original narrators of the myth held the belief that in general every living babe did but re-embody a pre-existent spirit. The antinomy arises out of the attempt to extend this theory of *actual*, to the case of *ultimate* origins. No philosopher, excepting of course Hegel, has quite succeeded in the effort to "hold himself up by his own waistband"; and there are doubts as to

¹ The tradition of gigantic stature attaches not only to the Anakim, but also to the Amorites who in Amos ii. 9 are compared to the sacred tree.

the success of Hegel. The ancient mythologist may have thought (*a*) that all the souls of all the Dead were embodied in the leaves and fruit of the Tree of Souls, and perhaps the other trees of the divine garden (in this case *every* tree would have its indwelling spirit); and (*b*) that the souls of all the Living issued from the Garden of the Gods¹. He may (*c*) have regarded the primal Man and Woman, naked, innocent, and ignorant of good and ill, as sharing the condition of the Babe at birth². And I think it not improbable that (*d*) there was a myth by which the primitive matriarch³, prior to the Birth of Man, became pregnant by partaking of the fruit of the Tree of Souls. In this way the Death-god Cain might incarnate the Death-god Tammuz.

It now becomes necessary to take account of the remarkable doctrine which is known in Christian theology as Traducianism, viz., that the soul is transmitted *in semine patris*; from which, as Maine I think relates, some legal theorists deduced the inference that the mother was merely an intermediary, the "nurse" of the germ received, and therefore no relation of her own child!⁴

This mode of thought cannot be primitive, since it is obviously a concomitant and support of the patriarchal system; but from its character it may well be of great antiquity. In nearly all the myths of Supernatural Birth collected by Mr. Hartland (excepting those cases which I have already cited), there is some distinct Means of Impregnation, some Vehicle of Life, or Embodiment of the Soul, some object, phenomenon, or influence which is

¹ "Souls awaiting incarnation hide in the drooping branches of the *coolabah* tree; and each child is born with a *coolabah* leaf in its mouth." Lang, "Incarnation and Reincarnation," *Independent Review*, Dec. 1904, p. 456 (Euahlayi tribe, N. S. W.).

² *J. Q. R.*, vol. X, "The Burning Bush," &c., *ad fin.* Cf. Isa. vii. 16.

³ וְהָיָה לָהּ כִּי יִלְדֶּה, Gen. iii. 20. Cf. iv. 1, which at least implies divine aid.

⁴ "A woman is only a nurse who takes care of a man's children for him." *The Native Races of South-East Australia*, p. 284 (Howitt); *Athenaeum*, Dec. 10, 1904.

in turn identified with the father, and also with the son. Thus was Danae made pregnant by the Shower of Gold, and so gave birth to Perseus. Thus, according to a wild legend, the Buddha entered his mother's womb in the form of a White Elephant. It should be observed that in the Gospel Narrative there is nothing corresponding to this. The Mother remains a Virgin, and conception is effected by the miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit, on which account the offspring is called "Son of God"¹: a very good example of the refining effect of Jewish thought upon the common mythology of the ancient world.

The Traducian doctrine carries with it important consequences. In the first place there arises from it a possible danger to the male parent, the effusion of his soul; and I am inclined to think that *this* was the evil which the rite of Circumcision, as a preliminary to Marriage, was designed in some way to avert. Secondly, as the offspring is regarded as an embodied portion of his father's spirit, there comes about a kind of identity between the divine father and the human son, the god and the king, Mars, for example, and Romulus; and (thirdly) between the founder of a dynasty and his successor, so that for instance, David's "spirit," his "quality," his "genius," and in last resort *himself*, might be held to live again in his representative².

The heroes of Israel belong to a stage of thought which has advanced beyond the doctrine of Divine Incarnation. Human parentage, on both sides, is a matter of course. Children and the fruit of the womb are an heritage and gift (Isa. ix. 5) that cometh from Jahveh³. But this is especially emphasized in the case of an Isaac, a Samson, or a Samuel, where the birth is contrary to expectation, or even against the course of nature. I do not think these narratives can be rightly understood, except by reference to the prior stage.

¹ Luke i. 35. Cf. Gen. i. 2.

² Hos. iii. 5 and Jer. xxx. 9.

³ Ps. cxxvii. 3. (Book of Common Prayer).

It is Inspiration which now replaces Incarnation. In especial crises the spirit of Jahveh comes mightily upon Samson or on Saul. It *rests* upon the mysterious child of Isa. xi. 2. In the days of the Judges we may be sure that wherever an individual manifested conspicuous ability in word or deed, in the affairs of peace or war—the courage, energy, resolution, the resource, prudence, and sagacity, which made a successful leader against the enemy, and a successful arbitrator of strife at home—in a word, the *רוח עצה*, *ונובירה* men would esteem him *θεόπνευστος*, a *מלאך אלהים*; they would affirm in the characteristic phrase of the Bible that Jahveh was “with him.” Such an one would become the *שופט*, the *vindex* of Israel, acting in this capacity as the instrument of the nation’s God. An historical person, Hero or Prophet, may thus acquire a supernatural, or even a mythical character, so that if mythical elements can be detected in the stories of Elijah, of Moses, of Abraham, we are not hastily to conclude that they never lived. The Prophet, Priest, and King, were all representatives or tenements of the deity, and were anointed in order that his spirit might be thus imparted to them. The rite is on this view a real sacrament¹, and its effects are expressly indicated in the case of Saul (1 Sam. x. 1, compared with ver. 7) and in that of David (chap. xvi. 13).

Unfortunately Sacraments are make-believe, a superstition identical with the principles of Magic. It is a wholesome though bitter truth, that an outward and visible sign cannot really confer an inward and spiritual grace, nor can official consecration bestow the gifts of genius upon a ruling family or a prophetic order. Two points, therefore, are necessary to the ideal Messiah;—hereditary succession and personal inspiration. He must *be* the Son

¹ Oil is an equivalent of blood, the vehicle of life or spirit. It may be noted that even in Rome the king had his face painted red; “the vermilion-painted face,” like the chariot described in a previous article, “belonged alike to the Roman god and to the Roman king” (Mommsen, Eng. trans. I, 83).

of David; he must *have*, in full measure, the Spirit of Jahveh.

Again employing the New Testament to illustrate the Old, and the Old to explain the New (since we can neither hope to understand the Origins of Christianity without recognizing its vast indebtedness to Judaism, nor fully understand Judaism without taking account of those elements which made it the parent of Christianity), we may observe that both these points are marked in the narrative of the Gospels. Jesus, we are expressly told in the Epistle to the Romans (i. 3) was born

“Of the seed of David, according to the flesh.”

And the genealogy which now opens the New Testament once ended with the words:—

“And Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom¹ he begat Jesus, who is called Christ.”

We do not hear that Jesus was in fact anointed, and perhaps he would have refused the rite. But at his baptism, which forms the true commencement of the Gospel narrative, “he saw,” we are told, “the heavens rent asunder, and the Spirit as a dove descending upon him: and a voice came out of the heavens, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased” (Mark i. 10, 11; Matt. iii. 16, 17; Luke iii. 22, “in a bodily form as a dove”). The dove was perhaps suggested by the expressions of Gen. i. 2; but how unlike the vulture of the ancient myth!

I shall bring this paper to a conclusion by an endeavour to supply the much-needed explanation of the Messianic name in Isa. ix. 5. It should run:—

פלא יועץ אל גבור
אבי ער שר שלום

¹ The authorities for the text (Matt. i. 16) fall into two classes. Those of class 1, the most and the best, have preserved the former part of the verse, as far as and including the words “of whom,” but modified the latter. Those of class 2 have done just the reverse. Verses 18–24 are a *Midrash*, interrupting the sequel.

The text, I believe, is quite sound. It consists of two parallel clauses, each a nominal sentence, in which the predicate precedes the subject. El-gibbor, here of course employed as a synonym for Jahveh, originally (it is probable) designated the Hebrew Hercules, the Wrestler-Hero of Gen. xxxii. 25-33, of whom Israel, Jacob, and Naphtali are alike appellations. There is no hostility between him and his divine antagonist, the "Face of God," since the latter bestows on him his blessing, as the God of Sinai makes bright the countenance of Moses, and as Sin is described as *munammir muši*. With the advance of monotheism it would seem that his personality was merged in that of Jahveh, himself an *אִישׁ מַלְחָמָה*. Jeremiah, contending with his own despair, utters the cry *יִהְיֶה אִתִּי כְנָבוֹר* (xx. 11). And comparing the present passage with Isa. vii. 14, we may hazard the conjecture that a similar invocation may have been employed by women in labour, and even that El-gibbor may have stood in a special relation to male offspring. He is here described as the Divine King of Israel, either as "a wondrous counsellor," or as one now "counselling," or "about to counsel, a wonder." (Cf. Isa. xxviii. 29, xxix. 14.)

As the subject of the first clause is a synonym of Jahveh, so is that of the second (*שֵׁר שְׁלֹמֶה*) of David. David is the Prince of Peace, i. e. the wholeness of estate which results from victories achieved and enemies overcome, like the *Pax Augusta*; of course with an allusion to Jerusalem. And the predicate *אָבִי עֵד* which in form may be compared with *אֵל עוֹלָם*¹, may be adequately explained from Ps. lxxxix. 30, *וְשִׁמְתִּי לְעֵד זֶרְעוֹ*:

"His seed also will I make to endure for ever."

The Name may now be rendered:—

The Mighty God doth counsel a wonder;

The Prince of Peace is a father evermore.

¹ Cf. Jer. xx. 17 *דָּרַת עוֹלָם* "ever pregnant." Also Gen. xvii. 7, 8 *אֶחָדָה עוֹלָם*, *בְּרִית עוֹלָם*.

APPENDIX.

The passage cited in the text was transcribed as long ago as 1899, from an article by Dr. Frazer on "The Origin of Totemism" in the *Fortnightly Review*¹. Since these pages were prepared for publication in 1904, independent evidence, in some cases involving a correction, has been supplied by Mr. Strehlow, missionary at Hermannsburg, to Mr. N. W. Thomas, who published it in an article on "The Religious Ideas of the Arunta," *Folk-Lore*, Dec., 1905 (vol. XVI, 428 sq.). I quote a few sentences.

"Spencer and Gillen assert . . . that *alcheri* means dream, and *Alche-ringa*, the dream times; this is a mistake. Dream is *altjirerinja*, a dreamer, *altjirarena*; a 'dream time' is unknown to the blacks. It is also erroneous to say that the Aranda believe in re-incarnation of ancestors; what they believe is that each birth is an incarnation of invisible individuals (not merely spirits), who live in trees, crevices, water-holes, &c., in human or animal form, and enter the bodies of women, being named after the species of animals from which they originated. The soul does not go back to the *knanakala* place at death, preparatory to reincarnation; it goes northwards, to the island of the dead, called *laia*, where it wanders for many years and is finally annihilated." *F. L. XVI*, 431.

There is an agreement as to *pre-existence*, a conflict of testimony as to *re-incarnation*. The analogies cited in the text, and the Hindu doctrine of transmigration, dispose me to accept the evidence of Spencer and Gillen. It is quite possible that inconsistent ideas as to the future of the soul may exist side by side in the savage mind.

GREY HUBERT SKIPWITH.

¹ See also *Adonis Attis Osiris*, Ed. 2, pp. 79-81.